

Serial No. 10/044,890
Filed: 01/11/2002
Page 10 of 12

Examiner: Theresa T. Snider
Group Art Unit: 1744

REMARKS

By the present amendment, claims 1-3, 11, 19 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 4, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 20, 21, 23, and 24 have been amended. New claim 25 has been added.

In the Office Action, the drawings have been objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(4)(5). Submitted herewith are proposed drawing corrections to FIGS. 5, 7, and 8 which Applicant believes will overcome the drawing objections. Clean copies of these corrected drawings are also enclosed herewith for entry by the Examiner.

The specification was objected to because the status of the copending application was not updated. By the present amendment, the status of the parent copending application has been added.

Claims 1-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards of the invention. Applicant has amended the claims by the present amendment to obviate any indefiniteness of the claims in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. The claims as amended are believed to be free of any objections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claims 1-3, 8, 12-14, 19-20, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Hasegawa et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,357,649 (Hasegawa et al. '649 patent). This rejection is respectfully traversed. By the present amendment, claims 1-3, 11, 19, and 22 have been cancelled. Allowed claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form. Further, limitations of claim 11 have been incorporated into independent claim 8. It is thus believed that claim 8 is allowable. Claims 9, 10, and 12-18 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 8. It is believed that all of these dependent claims are likewise allowable.

Claims 19-20, and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Field U.S. Patent No. 4,766,432. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 19 and 22 have been cancelled and claim 20 has been amended to depend from amended claim 23. Thus, the rejection of these claims over Field '432 is believed to be moot.

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al. '649. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Serial No. 10/044,890
Filed: 01/11/2002
Page 11 of 12

Examiner: Theresa T. Snider
Group Art Unit: 1744

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8, which is believed to be allowable in view of the amendments made by the present amendment.

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted state of the prior art as set forth in the preamble of the Jepson claim (aspa) in view of the Kubo et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,636,402. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Inasmuch as claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled, it is believed that this rejection is moot.

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Field '432. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Field '432 patent discloses a commercial floor scrubber mounted to a forklift and controlled from a remote signal. Speed and direction signals are transmitted through a controller. The speed signal is not displayed. A condition display and an alarm to indicate the failure of switches or a condition is disclosed.

Claim 21 calls for the step of communicating to the user an audible signal representative of the detected relative speed of the extraction cleaner. The Field reference does not disclose or suggest this step. It is thus believed that claim 21 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claims 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Field '432 in view of the Kubo et al. '402 patent. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Kubo et al. '402 patent discloses a robotic extractor in which the speed of the vehicle is detected and used to control the amount of solution that is deposited onto a floor surface. FIGS. 36 and 38 disclose a grip handle that includes a speed adjustment control 215 and a speed label for the speed adjustment knob.

The alleged combination of Field '432 and Kubo et al. '402 traversed. There is no basis for making the alleged combination. These machines are significantly different and there is no suggestion as to how the comparison of the Kubo et al. '402 patent could be incorporated into the Field '432 maintenance machine. The Examiner has not demonstrated any link that would enable this combination to be made.

Even if the combination were to be made, however, untenably, it still would not reach the limitations of claims 23 and 24. Claim 23 calls for the step of generating a predetermined reference signal and comparing the reference signal to the speed signal. It further calls for the

Serial No. 10/044,890
Filed: 01/11/2002
Page 12 of 12

Examiner: Theresa T. Snider
Group Art Unit: 1744

step of communicating to the user a detected relative speed of the extraction cleaner. This concept is not disclosed in the alleged combination of Field '432 and Kubo et al. '402. As indicated above, Field '432 does not disclose an indication of the relative speed of the maintenance machine. Thus, the combination lacks this step.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims in the application are in condition for allowance. Early notification of allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL N. HANSEN

Dated: 2-19-04

By: 

John E. McGarry, Reg. No. 22,360
McGARRY BAIR PC
171 Monroe Avenue, NW, Suite 600
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503
616-742-3500

G0118339